

Interview Summary

Application No.

09/334,649

Applicant(s)

Heinz

Examiner

Kim M. Lewis

Group Art Unit

3761

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Kim M. Lewis (examiner)

(3) _____

(2) Carl Schaukowitch (attorney)

(4) _____

Date of Interview Sep 12, 2000Type: ☐ Telephonic ☒ Personal (copy is given to ☐ applicant ☒ applicant's representative).Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: ☒ Yes ☐ No. If yes, brief description:Applicant presented a sample of his invention along with a sample of a prior art device.Agreement ☒ was reached. ☐ Was not reached.Claim(s) discussed: 1 and proposed claims 37-43

Identification of prior art discussed:

Heinz

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

First applicant's attorney presented the examiner with a sample of the instant invention and a prior art device. The examiner donned each sample to determine the ease at which the instant invention can be tightened about the user. Next, the examiner asked applicant's attorney to discuss the differences between newly proposed claim 37 and claim 1. Applicant's attorney stated that the major difference was the introduction of the concept of a tab member. After reviewing the claim, the examiner indicated that claim 37 defined over the prior art of record. Next applicant's attorney indicated that the banks of pulleys are detachable from the individual segments and suggested adding claims to define such. The examiner indicated that applicant would be allowed to enter new claims in the application since he is not under final. Finally, applicant's attorney stated that he would amend claim 1 to include the tab member concept and a set of claims including the detachable banks.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

1. ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

Unless the paragraph above has been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a response to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW.

2. ☐ Since the Examiner's interview summary above (including any attachments) reflects a complete response to each of the objections, rejections and requirements that may be present in the last Office action, and since the claims are now allowable, this completed form is considered to fulfill the response requirements of the last Office action. Applicant is not relieved from providing a separate record of the interview unless box 1 above is also checked.

Kim M. Lewis
Primary Examiner
AU 3761

Examiner Note: You must sign and stamp this form unless it is an attachment to a signed Office action.